

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 317 139

HE 023 358

AUTHOR Saville, Anthony; Master, Nancy  
TITLE A Survey of Summer Session Operations of Land Grant Universities and Selected Private Universities in the United States.  
PUB DATE 89  
NOTE 14p.  
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)  
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.  
DESCRIPTORS \*Administration; Educational Finance; Faculty Workload; Higher Education; \*Land Grant Universities; National Surveys; Part Time Faculty; Private Colleges; Scheduling; State Colleges; State Universities; \*Summer Programs; \*Teacher Salaries; Teaching Load

## ABSTRACT

A survey was conducted to study selected operational characteristics of summer programs at the 107 land grant colleges and universities in the United States and also at 15 selected private institutions. Respondents (N=82) indicated that their summer programs included all or part of their traditional academic load plus some special options. The five private institutions which responded indicated that financing and compensation were based on student enrollment and special fees. Forty-one of the land grant respondents indicated that their summer schools were self-supporting. The 36 land-grant institutions receiving external support provided higher compensation for their faculty and allowed greater programmatic freedom. These institutions tended to use percentages of salaries in determining faculty compensation, while self-supporting programs utilized funds per credit hour. Self-supporting programs tended to have more restrictions and paperwork. Management patterns of the summer school programs varied, with most being directed by the academic vice president, provost, or dean and some having part-time summer sessions directors. Thirty-one different combinations of summer session times were reported, with four basic patterns predominating. Most institutions reported a maximum number of credits a student could take during the summer. Eighty percent of the institutions indicated that faculty were limited to teaching a certain number of courses or credits per session. Four references. (JDD)

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
\* from the original document. \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

ED317139

A SURVEY OF SUMMER SESSION  
OPERATIONS OF LAND GRANT  
UNIVERSITIES AND SELECTED  
PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES  
IN THE UNITED STATES

by

Anthony Saville, Professor  
Educational Administration  
and Higher Education  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas 89154

and

Nancy Master  
Education Bibliographer  
Dickinson Library  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas 89154

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS  
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

ANTHONY SAVILLE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
Office of Educational Research and Improvement  
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION  
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as  
received from the person or organization  
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve  
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-  
ment do not necessarily represent official  
OERI position or policy.

HE 023 358

## ABSTRACT

The American Land Grant Colleges and Universities were founded in 1862 when President Abraham Lincoln signed into law the Morrill Land Grant Act which gave each state (including new states) income from 30,000 acres or equivalent in scrip for each Senator and Representative. The funds were to be used by the states to support and maintain at least one college where, without excluding current scientific and classical studies, various practical and professional programs such as agriculture, mining, and mechanical arts (engineering) were to be promoted. The Act encouraged the development of a more liberal and expanded education to the masses and has become one of the most unique and successful systems of higher education in the world. Several of these 107 land grant institutions have earned international reputations in nearly every academic and professional field of study.

The purpose of this survey was to study selected operational characteristics of summer programs in these particular institutions. We found, to no surprise, a wide variation in practically all aspects of management. The major area of commonality was in the concept of diversity, a diversity in management, financing, scheduling, programs and staffing. The very positive aspect was creativity in these areas, a feature not always prevalent during the regular sessions of these institutions.

A SURVEY OF SUMMER SESSION OPERATIONS OF LAND GRANT UNIVERSITIES  
AND SELECTED PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES IN THE UNITED STATES

Historical Background

One stepchild of the American college and university system is the summer session. Its development has been relatively slow until recent years, and even now it has not been completely embraced by all administrators and faculty. It was not until the late 1860's that the antecedents of the current summer programs emerged when universities pioneering in scientific field research were among the first to initiate summer programs and courses.

As an example, Harvard sponsored its first geological expedition in the West in 1869, and by 1879 Johns Hopkins had its zoology laboratory operating primarily during the summer session. Numerous projects in other institutions followed. Modern scientific study often required field work which flourished during the summer months. The consequence: scientific research developed as a summertime phenomenon in our colleges and universities and proved to be a leader in accepting this new programmatic stepchild in higher education.<sup>1</sup>

The general education movement also began to expand at this time. Chautauqua, founded in 1874 by Methodist Bishop John Vincent, promoted the idea of education as a lifelong process. It served as a platform for the issues of the day and as a university for the people, regardless of age or prior education. Chautauqua was noted for dynamic name speakers, book clubs, summer schools, recreation, and musical training. University presidents such as William Rainey Harper of Chicago adapted the Chautauqua constructs in their institutions.<sup>2</sup>

Professional educators were also cognizant of these national trends. From about the mid-nineteenth century on, "institutes" had been conducted in various states to review and drill poorly trained teachers in elementary

## Survey of Summer Sessions...2

school subjects. About 1880 other forms of inservice began to appear. Among these were teachers' reading circles, summer schools and extension courses offered by universities and normal schools. The summer schools and extension courses provided the teachers with a more sophisticated education and with college credit.<sup>3</sup>

The first Chautauqua Teachers' Retreat was organized in 1879 to provide teachers with both a vacation and intellectual stimulation. Similarly, the University of Wisconsin in 1887 opened its Summer School for Teachers, a direct ancestor of the institution's present day program.

According to Clay Schoenfeld, former Dean of the University of Wisconsin's Summer Sessions, these early trends are reflected in current summer programs, particularly in land grant institutions whose original purpose was outreach and extension. On the one hand, summer sessions were extensions of the teaching function beyond the traditional academic year which allowed both undergraduate and graduate students to pursue their degrees year round. On the other, there were numerous workshops, institutes, conferences and outreach programs devoted to public service and serving special populations in the community. These many cultural and recreational out-of-class activities reflect the Chautauquan heritage.<sup>4</sup>

In 1889 a historian, Frederick Jackson Turner, author of frontier theory in American history, developed some flowery advertisements in the summer school Prospectus for the University of Wisconsin. Although modern marketing techniques are less colorful, summer schools continue to advertise their wares through folders, posters, fliers, TV, etc. Vice President Eleanor McMahon of Rhode Island College indicates that summer sessions are devices providing "a testing ground for new markets and new market strategies which can be transferred into the academic year."<sup>5</sup>

### Survey of Summer Sessions...3

Thus, in addition to basic classes and ongoing research projects, modern institutions generally have accepted summer sessions as a viable means for using independent studies, curriculum experimentation, sponsoring study in foreign lands, accepting non-traditional students and experimenting with the improvement of teaching and higher education management.

#### The Survey

The purpose of this study was to examine specific operational characteristics of summer session programs in the 107 land grant institutions and 15 selected private institutions in the U.S.

The following questions served as a basis for the collection and analysis of data:

1. How are summer programs financed?
2. How are resident and visiting faculty reimbursed for summer session service?
3. Who manages the summer sessions?
4. What programs are available?
5. Is there an interpretable relationship between institutional academic philosophy and the actual implementation of summer session programs?  
(Faculty compensation will be a major focal point.)

We were aware of the Summary of Reports of the Associated University Summer Sessions compiled by the Indiana University Summer Sessions Office, but for the purposes of this study limited our sample to the land grant and selected private institutions and to differing data in some instances.

A seventy-one item questionnaire was sent to 122 summer session managers at 107 land grant institutions and 15 selected private colleges and universities through the country.

#### Survey of Summer Sessions...4

Eighty-two or 67 percent of the institutions responded. Seventy-seven (72 percent) of the 107 land grant institutions responded, and five of the 15 private institutions returned a completed survey.

#### Demographics

All 82 respondents indicated having some type of summer program. Enrollments ranged from 22,057 total students (including duplication in two or more sessions) to a low of 250. As many as 2,660 faculty were involved in one university to 38 at the smallest program reported.

The oldest ongoing program was Harvard (112 years) and the oldest land grant program was Minnesota at 109 years. The mean for all reporting institutions was slightly over 65 years.

#### The Programs, Their Financial Support and Compensation

The question of fiscal support for summer school programs directly relates to whether institutional philosophies regarding purposes of summer schools is actually implemented at as consistent a level as stated by the universities.

Programmatically, all respondents indicated that summer sessions included all or part of their traditional academic load plus some special options. Programs included in their summer sessions reported by 80 of the 82 institutions were

- Regular classes at all levels

- Special one- through 13-week courses, workshops, seminars

- Independent study

- Experimental courses

- Foreign travel

- Remedial classes, seminars

- Special research projects/laboratory projects

## Survey of Summer Sessions...5

Specially funded projects

Regular or ongoing research, seminars, etc.

Non-traditional programs for high school students, minorities

Several of the institutions included brochures citing the academic/professional values and importance of their summer sessions. When the question of how summer sessions were financed, however, the pocketbook figures did not always match the institutional statements. As expected, all five private institutions indicated that financing and compensation were based on student enrollment and special fees. In these institutions a considerable amount of autonomy was granted to the individual schools and colleges to administer their own programs in the same manner as their regular year operations were handled.

Table 1 summarizes the type of financial support received by the 74 land grant institutions.

TABLE 1

### Types of Fiscal Support for Summer Sessions (77 Land Grant Institutions)

|                                                |           |     |
|------------------------------------------------|-----------|-----|
| Self Supporting Summer Programs                | 41        | 53% |
| Assistance Received for Summer School Programs | 36        | 47% |
| 100 percent support                            | 15*       |     |
| 75 percent support                             | 3         |     |
| 50 percent support                             | 8         |     |
| 25 percent support                             | 10        |     |
|                                                | <u>36</u> |     |

\*Those with 100 percent support operated summer sessions as a regular, continuing phase of their yearly programs.

Fifty-three percent of the respondents indicated that summer schools were self supporting; a surprising figure in light of the philosophical goal

## Survey of Summer Sessions...6

statements of many of these institutions. The inconsistencies were disturbing. In every instance but one, the 36 institutions receiving or providing external support provided higher compensation for their faculty and allowed greater programmatic freedom. In all instances the external support came from state funding.

### Faculty Compensation

Two factors emerged from the data we collected in this area. One, those institutions with external support systems generally paid better and permitted more programmatic freedom via management processes. The more support, the more the summer session programs mirrored the regular year in every way, and faculty compensation was directly proportional to their annual salaries.

Secondly, those land grant institutions having summer program support tended to use percentages of salaries as opposed to the self supporting programs utilizing funds per credit hour. Self supporting programs tended to have more restrictions, particularly through an additional management layer, and paperwork than those operating as part of the regular university program. The major exceptions to this were the private institutions who operated on a self supporting basis all year.

Table 2 provides some examples of compensation formulas used by the supported and self supporting programs.

TABLE 2  
Examples of Faculty Compensation

| Percentage or Ratio of Annual Salary |                                  | Per Credit Hour Ranges<br>(Based on Faculty Rank) |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| up to 49% of Salary for 8 weeks      |                                  |                                                   |
| 33%                                  | 1/12 of annual salary per course | \$601 - 1161 per credit hour                      |
| 30%                                  |                                  | 400 - 1000 per credit hour                        |
| 28%                                  | 1/9 of base per course           | 485 - 1083 per credit hour                        |
| 22%                                  |                                  | 615 - 955 per credit hour                         |
| 20%                                  | 3.67% of base per course         | 800 - 950 per credit hour                         |
| 16.7%                                | 3.33% of base per course         | 650 - 950 per credit hour                         |
| 15%                                  |                                  | 500 - 700 per credit hour                         |
| 11%                                  | 1.36 of base per credit          | 300 - 800 per credit hour*                        |

\*lowest reported

Visiting faculty were compensated as follows:

FIGURE 1  
Visiting Faculty Compensation

- 37 institutions paid the same rate as regular faculty using same formula as for their own faculty
- 30 used a flat fee negotiated with department chairs and college/school deans
- 2 did not use visiting faculty
- 8 did not respond

#### Travel Costs

- 51 did not pay travel costs or provide special stipends to cover expenses
- 16 paid travel costs — 8 of these indicated that this was based upon individual negotiations

## Survey of Summer Sessions...8

### Management of Summer Sessions

Management patterns of summer school programs varied among the 82 responding institutions. Only 12 indicated that these were part-time positions, and at least 62, regardless of title, reported to the academic vice president or provost or dean of the campus. The private schools operated regular programs directly through their schools and colleges as did at least 20 of the land grant institutions.

The question of need for a summer sessions director as another management layer is a valid one. The practice of part-time directors being given programmatic load and authority over college/school deans is a questionable effective management practice and brings up the question of cost effectiveness and efficiency in the administration of the institution.

The breakdown on management patterns was as follows:

#### Management of Summer Sessions

- 42 Deans or Directors of Summer Sessions  
16 of these were part-time positions. The 26 others were permanent year-round. In nearly all instances they reported directly to the vice president for academic affairs (provost).
- 12 Directors of Continuing Education--or worked in that office
- 23 Summer Sessions were directly under Academic Vice President or Provost and operated as regular academic/professional programs--no summer sessions director.
- 3 Listed other positions such as Associate Dean of Graduate Studies and Summer Session Director, Associate Dean of University College and Summer Session Director, etc.
- 2 No response

### Length of Summer Session

Thirty-one different combinations of summer session times were reported, although four basic patterns with numerous variations were predominant. There were combinations of pre- and post-sessions, sliding schedules where two four- or five-week sessions would begin and end at different times (thus actually

## Survey of Summer Sessions...9

providing four five-week patterns); split sessions; sessions ranging from one to thirteen weeks in one-week units (usually with a sliding schedule); five, six and eleven-week session combinations; one eight-week plus one three or three one-week classes, etc., etc. There certainly was no lack of creativity in this area. The public schools' ending dates appeared to be one major factor with respect to starting dates.

Table 3 summarizes the six basic patterns.

TABLE 3  
Length of Summer Sessions

| Number of<br>Institutions | Length of<br>Session (Weeks) | Variations |    |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|------------|----|
|                           |                              | Yes        | No |
| 18                        | 5                            | X          |    |
| 20                        | 6                            | X          |    |
| 29                        | 8                            | X          |    |
| 13                        | 1-13                         | X          |    |
| 2                         | no response                  |            |    |
| <hr/> 82                  |                              |            |    |

Note: a. 62 institutions offered two or more sessions  
b. all offered variations of some

### Credit Limitations

Twelve institutions reported no maximum number of credits a student could take during the summer. Sixty-six indicated some type of limitation (two did not respond to this item). The general patterns were one credit for one week or time equivalent or one credit above the total weeks session. For example:

|              |          |
|--------------|----------|
| 6 credits    | 5 weeks  |
| 9 for        | 8 weeks  |
| up to 16 for | 12 weeks |

## Survey of Summer Sessions...10

Although general limits were established, departments, schools and colleges had authority to waive these maximums in special cases.

In only one institution did the summer director (a part-time position) have authority over the college and school deans--a questionable management practice. Fifteen graduate programs indicated no credit limit but in general they followed the same patterns noted above.

### Faculty Load

Instructors, too, were generally subject to maximum credits taught. Eighty percent indicated that faculty were limited to a certain number of courses or credits per session. The normal load appears to be two courses or six credits per five-week session, although this varied to six credits for four-week sessions. In longer sessions of ten to thirteen weeks, three courses or more could be taught. In nearly all cases the respondent indicated that exceptions were allowed based upon department and college/school approval--summer school directors were not authorized to determine this load factor.

Sixty-three of the 77 respondents indicated that they did not have a ceiling on the number of independent studies an instructor could supervise for pay. The nine schools with restrictions provided answers that ranged from "reasonable" to "only paid for so many." Two institutions had no independent study and one only for laboratory courses. Two did not respond to this question. In one institution the part-time summer director was authorized to overrule decisions on student load made by the student's department and college dean.

### Summary

The results of our survey tend to support the concept that summer sessions remain a vital and necessary part of academe. Although they all have

## Survey of Summer Sessions...11

not completely matched their educational philosophies with operational matters such as compensation proportion...i with regular year teaching, they have provided some creative time scheduling, course offerings, seminars, laboratory sessions concomitant with what outsiders might expect of institutions of higher education.

The management structure needs to be studied by each institution. In general, based upon several comments received in the survey, it appears that summer sessions could be managed more efficiently by the departments, schools and colleges in the same way regular sessions are run without an additional and potentially costly administrative layer. If there is a need for a separate summer school dean or director, their prime purpose would be to coordinate the summer programs as a service to the students and faculty and work cooperatively with departments, schools and colleges where the students and faculty are housed and function.

Summer sessions provided one of the best examples we seem to have of creative programming in higher education—the future is bright.

### FOOTNOTES

1. Jenkins, John W. & Teicher, Barry. (1985). Origins and History of the UW Summer Session. In Education in Summer: 100 Years at UW Madison, p. 2. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin, Division of Summer Sessions and Inter-College Programs.
2. Mundt, John J. (1978-79, December-January). Chatauqua—A Tradition for the Future. Change 10 (11), 24.
3. Yarger, Sam J. (1985). Inservice Teacher Education. In Harold E. Mitzel (Ed.), Encyclopedia of Educational Research (Vol. 2, p. 883). New York: The Free Press.
4. Schoenfeld, Clay. (1985). The American University in Summer Revisited. In Education in Summer: 100 Years at UW-Madison, p. 27. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin, Division of Summer Sessions and Inter-College Programs.
5. Ibid, p. 29.